UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,235	03/08/2000	KISHORE S SWAMINATHAN	AND1P535	1907

28164	7590	12/04/2006

ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P O BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/521,235	SWAMINATHAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 September 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11,13,15,17-19 and 21-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11,13,15,17-19 and 21-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/10/2006</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 09/05/2006 to the

original application filed 03/08/2000.

Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15, 17-19, and 21-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims

1, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 28 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been

withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed 09/05/2006 has been

entered.

Specification

3.   The cross references related to the application cited in the specification must be updated

(i.e., update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where

appropriate, on page 1). Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19, and 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over **Bezos et al.** (US 6029141, filed 02/2000) in view of **Wical**

(US 6460034, filed 05/21/1997)

As to claims 1, 7, and 13:

Bezos teaches a method, a computer readable medium, and a computer system for

developing a dossier for a proposal *(see Abstract)* comprising the steps of:

- receiving into the computer a name of a client relevant to the proposal *(e.g., an online registration process for allowing other entities 'individuals, companies, etc.' to register as associates ... creates an entry in the associate database according to the information provided by the enrolling associate; col.6, lines 21-30 / a customer access an associate's Web site; col.11, lines 30-43)*;

- presenting on a computer-user interface *(e.g., to be displayed on the customer computer 108)* associated with the client a list *(e.g., merchant Web site 106)* consisting of industries *(e.g., business entities/associates or respective business partners who marketing products and selling products on the merchant Web site) [see the Abstract and the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 50]*.

- allowing selection of an industry from the list of industries *(e.g., allows the customer to select products from multiple different Web sites; see Abstract and col.2, line 66-col.3, line 2)*;

- searching in a plurality of computer-readable knowledge repositories for information relating to the client and the selected industry *(e.g., allow potential customers to link to the merchant's Web site to initiate purchases of such products from the merchant) [see the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col. 1, line 62]*;

- allowing selection of information for display in the dossier *(e.g., when the customer clicks on this hyperlink 808, the merchant Web server 132 returns a dynamic-generated HTML document that displays the contents of the shopping cart ...displays information about the products currently selected by the customer; col. 15, lines 10-27)*;

- allowing verification that the information displayed is correct, and if not correct, allowing correction of the displayed information *(e.g., Fig. 10c shows a shopping card Web page displaying the products selected by the customer. The Web page allows the customer to double check the products he/she selected. The customer can delete an item that he/she does not want to purchase and/or the customer can change the quantity of the product(s) that he/she wants to purchase; see also col. 2, lines 48-65 and 15, lines 28-50)*;

- preparing the dossier utilizing the information found during the searching, wherein the dossier comprises information relevant to the selected industry, the

client and the proposal, and further comprises information concerning

experienced people, prior documents, and past project pertaining to the proposal

(e.g., fig.10b is illustrated as a dossier that collects relevance data for user. If a

user selects an author name, the search result will be a dossier including

information about this author, all documents or projects about this author).

Bezos, however, does not specifically teach "*arranging the information in the dossier*

into expandable nodes which expand into subnodes, wherein the expandable nodes are

arranged according to categories of people, topics, clients, document and projects."

Wical teaches arranging the information in the dossier into expandable nodes which

expand into subnodes *(e.g., the knowledge base 155 includes a hierarchy of categories*

and terminology, based on the arrangement of categories in the knowledge catalog 150,

augmented to include contextual information learned from processing the documents and

manually noted by linguists. In one embodiment, the knowledge base 155, packaged as a

commercial product, may contain classification and contextual information based on

processing and/or compilation of thousands of documents), wherein the expandable

nodes are arranged according to categories of people, topics *(e.g., topics or categories)*,

clients *(e.g., user)*, document *(e.g., documents)* and projects [*see the discussion beginning*

at col. 4, line 4 – col. 6, line 33].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bezos with Wical because Wical's teaching would have provided the user with global view of the information sought by identifying topics related to the search query.

As to claims 2 and 8:

Bezos teaches presenting an alternate list consisting of industries not associated with the client *(col. 1, lines 62-66)*.

As to claim 3:

Bezos teaches information is selected for display in the dossier by checking check-boxes for at least one of people, documents, and projects *(col. 16, lines 10-41)*.

As to claim 4:

Bezos teaches the dossier information is corrected by returning to at least one previous step in the method and re-selecting the information *(col. 12, lines 14-51 & see fig. 10C and the associated text)*.

As to claim 5:

Bezos teaches the people section is arranged according to the number of documents and projects an individual has produced related to the client or industry *(col. 9, lines 9-29)*.

As to claim 6:

Bezos teaches the documents and projects sections are arranged chronologically *(col.16, lines 10-41)*.

As to Claims 9 and 15:

Bezos teaches displays topics associated with the client *(col.6, line 21-col.7, line5)* and allows selection of at least one of the topics for insertion of information relating to the selected at least one of the topics in the dossier *(see figs. 8-9 and the associated text)*.

As to claim 11 and 17:

The information concerning people is arranged according to the number of documents and projects as individual has produced related to the client or industry *(col.16, lines 11-41)*.

As to claim 18:

The information concerning documents is arranged chronologically and the information concerning projects is arranged chronologically *(col.16, lines 11-41)*.

As to claim 19:

Bezos teaches searching for information relating to the at least one of the selected topics, and displaying the information related to the at least one of the selected topics *(col.9, lines 9-36)*.

As to claims 21 and 23:

Bezos teaches the list of associated industries is presented in response to receiving the

name of the client *(e.g., business entities/associates) [see the Abstract and the merchant's*

Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 50].

As to claims 22 and 24:

Bezos teaches storing the association of one or more industries with the name of the

client *(see Abstract & col.2, lines 18-65).*

As to claim 25:

Bezos teaches displaying a list of clients matching the received client name and allowing

selection of a client from the list *(see the select products from multiple different sites*

discussion beginning at col.2, line 66).

As to claim 26:

Bezos teaches allowing selection of information for display in the proposal dossier *(e.g.,*

when the customer clicks on this hyperlink 808, the merchant Web server 132 returns a

dynamic-generated HTML document that displays the contents of the shopping cart

...displays information about the products currently selected by the customer; col.15,

lines 10-27).

As to claim 27:

Bezos teaches the items selected for display are the most relevant items, based on a

weight schema that takes into account relevant with respect to at least one of the client,

the selected industry, and a topic *(col.15, line 27-60)*.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 09/05/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that Bezos does not teach *the information in the dossier*

into expandable nodes which expand into subnodes, wherein the expandable nodes are

arranged according to categories of people, topics, clients, document and projects

[Remarks, page 7].

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that the introduction of Wical, as

combined with Bezos meets the limitations as claimed by Applicant. Wical teaches

arranging the information in the dossier into expandable nodes which expand into

subnodes *(e.g., the knowledge base 155 includes a hierarchy of categories and*

terminology, based on the arrangement of categories in the knowledge catalog 150,

augmented to include contextual information learned from processing the documents and

manually noted by linguists. In one embodiment, the knowledge base 155, packaged as a

commercial product, may contain classification and contextual information based on

processing and/or compilation of thousands of documents), wherein the expandable

nodes are arranged according to categories of people, topics *(e.g., topics or categories)*,

clients *(e.g., user)*, document *(e.g., documents)* and projects [*see the discussion beginning*

at col. 4, line 4 – col. 6, line 33].

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

- Kirk et al.   U.S. Pat. No. 5,768,578   issued: Jun. 16, 1998

- Swartz et al.   U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,994   issued: May 22, 2001

- Weiner et al.   U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,229   issued: Apr. 14, 2001

- Doerre et al.   U.S. Pat. No. 6,446,061   issued: Sep. 3, 2002

- Brody et al., "*Integrating Disparate Knowledge Sources*," Second International

  Conference on The Practical Application Knowledge Management (PAKeM'99),

  21-23 April 1999, London, pp. 1-6.

- E. Liongosari et al., "*In Search of A New Generation of Knowledge Management*

  Application," ACM SIGGROUP Bulletin, July 1999, pp. 1-4.

- E. Rennison, *"Galaxy of News: An Approach to Visualizing and Understanding Eexpansive News Landscapes,"* ACM, November 1994, pp. 3-12.

Contact information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Maikhanh Nguyen